

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 401 939

IR 056 214

AUTHOR Turano, Frances M.
TITLE A Survey of Types of Cooperation between Schools and Public Libraries in Ohio.
PUB DATE May 96
NOTE 34p.; Master's Research Paper, Kent State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Children; Cooperative Planning; *Cooperative Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Librarian Teacher Cooperation; Library Cooperation; Library Role; Library Services; Library Surveys; *Partnerships in Education; *Public Libraries; *Schools; *Shared Resources and Services
IDENTIFIERS Ohio

ABSTRACT

Cooperation between schools and public libraries is an important element of library service to children and young adults. A questionnaire was mailed to a random sample of 88 public libraries in Ohio in order to identify the types of cooperative efforts currently taking place. The survey achieved a return rate of 67% (n=59). A model was created to classify the types of cooperation according to the characteristics of the activities in which the respondents were engaged. Five levels of cooperation were included in the model: no cooperation, informal communication, informal cooperation, formal cooperation, and formal coordination. The majority of activities mentioned by respondents fell within the category of informal cooperation, at which activities often focus on a specific event or issue, such as a book-talk or class visit. All of the libraries surveyed engaged in some form of cooperative activity with public schools, with the most common activities including: class visits to the public library; written/oral communication to school personnel promoting library services; planning and promotion of summer reading programs; assignment alerts; and resource sharing. Reasons why there appears to be no movement to higher levels of cooperation and suggestions for future studies are discussed. Appendices include the survey and cover letter. (Contains 20 references.) (Author/SWC)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A SURVEY OF TYPES OF COOPERATION BETWEEN
SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC LIBRARIES IN OHIO

A Master's Research Paper submitted to the
Kent State University School of Library Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Master of Library Science

by

Frances M. Turano

May, 1996

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. DuMont

ABSTRACT

Cooperation between schools and public libraries is an important element of library service to children and young adults. A questionnaire was mailed to a random sample of public libraries in Ohio in order to identify the types of cooperative efforts currently taking place. A model was created to classify the types of cooperation according to the characteristics of the activities in which the respondents were engaged. Five levels of cooperation were included in the model: no cooperation, informal communication, informal cooperation, formal cooperation, formal coordination. It was determined that the majority of activities mentioned by respondents fell within the level three category of informal cooperation. Reasons why there appears to be no movement to higher levels of cooperation are discussed. Future studies could investigate the reasons for this or attitudes toward collaborative efforts.

Master's Research Paper by

Frances M. Turano

B. S., Bowling Green State University, 1976

M.L.S., Kent State University, 1996

Approved by

Adviser Lars Buttlar Date 4-16-96

ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	iv
LIST OF TABLES	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	2
Definition of Terms	3
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	4
III. METHODOLOGY	8
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	9
V. CONCLUSION	21
APPENDIX	
A. QUESTIONNAIRE	23
B. COVER LETTER	25
REFERENCE LIST	26

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. A Model for Cooperation Between Schools and Public Libraries	18

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Classification of Respondents by Demographic Characteristics	10
2.	Personnel Responsible for Cooperative Activities	11
3.	Total Number of Respondents Participating in Individual Cooperative Activities	12
4.	Initiating Cooperative Activities by Institution	13
5.	Top Three Most Utilized Activities	14
6.	Factors Ensuring Successful Cooperative Activities	16

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Cooperation between schools and public libraries has been recognized as an important factor in broadening the potential information base available to children and young adults. The emphasis on providing the best possible library service to this age group through cooperative ventures has received a great amount of coverage in the literature. In fact, school and public library cooperation has received consistent attention for over one hundred years.

Formal recognition of the relationship between schools and public libraries came in 1897, when the National Education Association (NEA), encouraged by John Cotton Dana, president of the American Library Association (ALA), issued a report which advocated school and public library cooperation (1899).

The earliest cooperative efforts were based on the belief that children needed to be encouraged to read as much as possible and that public libraries should support schools by providing enough books to meet the demand (Fasick 1991). The first half of the twentieth century saw a growth in public library service to children, but the establishment of school libraries in the 1950s changed the public library's role from a substitutive one to a more supplementary role.

Federal legislation in the 1960s and 1970s provided

funds to improve school library collections and services. Interlibrary cooperation was supported by Title III of the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) in 1966. Throughout the 1980s however, both schools and public libraries saw a reduction in federal funding. These reductions, combined with diminished local budgets, cost increases, and the information explosion have caused both institutions to consider alternatives to providing service and materials by joining forces in cooperative ventures.

Purpose of the Study

Previous studies dealing with school and public library cooperation have been concerned with describing the types of activities being used and the reasons for success. Callison's national survey of public library cooperative efforts with schools indicated that more communication was needed to increase cooperation (1991). Communication can only come, however, when the commitment, in the form of defining roles and setting goals and objectives, is firmly in place.

This study attempted to determine the types of cooperation taking place in Ohio. It also attempted to classify these efforts according to the characteristics of the activities in which libraries engaged. The process of determining the status of cooperative efforts at the state level was utilized to create a model for individual libraries in Ohio. The information generated by this survey may provide a basis for evaluating a library's progress in cooperative programming.

Definition of Terms

For this study, school and public library cooperation is defined as those activities which involve joint participation by schools and public libraries and which are undertaken to provide improved services to children and young adults.

The term young adult is used to define those students between the ages of thirteen and eighteen. Children is used to define those students who are twelve years of age and under.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

According to Ralph H. Stenstrom, there was an enormous increase in the literature relating to school and public library cooperation in the years following passage of the amendment to the Library Services and Construction Act in 1966. In his annotated bibliography, he cited 383 articles dealing with cooperation among all types of libraries, but he also pointed out the insufficient amount of evaluative and quantitative literature (Stenstrom 1970).

Ten years later, Aaron's overview of the current status of the research identified some of the areas that had been investigated, including: status of existing programs; opinions and attitudes relating to cooperation; factors in success or failure; and methods of planning and implementing. She recommended that future studies should be conducted that would indicate in more detail the specific levels and types of activities and also ensure their successful implementation and support (Aaron 1981).

Articles which describe successful programs and offer suggestions on implementation are often referred to as "how-to-do-it" articles. A search of current library indexes revealed that this type of article appears frequently in the literature. Some of these articles describe joint conferences of school and public libraries which share information about cooperative efforts (Reading 1992). Others

may describe funded programs designed to link schools and public libraries (Del Vecchio 1993), and yet others merely describe the success of a program and serve more as a public relations tool for the individual library (Bloom 1992).

In response to pleas for more quantitative and evaluative data on cooperation, a number of studies have been conducted which have attempted to survey attitudes and opinions of professionals and assess factors that may influence cooperative efforts. A survey conducted in 1986 to measure cooperative activities and communication between school and public libraries in Indiana indicated low levels of cooperation, little planning, and a lack of communication (Callison, Fink, and Hager 1989). Their findings duplicated those from a similar study conducted fourteen years earlier (Woolls 1972). In 1989, Callison duplicated his own survey at the national level and his findings provided concrete evidence of the need for more communication to improve cooperation (1991).

A 1990 study of cooperative programs in Ohio indicated that the most frequent types of cooperation were those requiring the least amount of cooperative effort, i.e., those that require "occasional communication" rather than "regular communication" (Wolfe 1990, 14). Wolfe's findings were later supported in a survey of school librarians in Ohio (Weiser, 1992).

Cooperation between schools and public libraries was a component part of two larger surveys conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in order to collect statistical data on services and resources for

children and young adults provided by public libraries. Both surveys were mailed to a national probability sample of 846 libraries from a universe of 14,174 institutions. The survey, which measured young adult services, revealed that even though 25% of public library patrons were young adults, library cooperation programs for that group were very low in number (Chelton 1989). On the other hand, results of the survey measuring childrens services indicated that children make up 37% of the library patron population and that libraries cooperated with 83% of the schools in their service area (Roy 1993).

In most of the articles dealing with school and public library cooperation, the one factor that is emphasized as being important to success is communication. Initiating dialogue is viewed as the first step in the communication process and it is up to many different groups, not just public librarians, to take the first step (Fitzgibbons 1989). Vandergrift (1994) has developed an instrument to initiate a dialogue between school and public librarians which can also be used as an evaluative tool.

The idea that communication is part of an ongoing process is not addressed in much of the literature. This is possibly because so many of the descriptive articles view cooperation as an end and not as the means for providing better service to children and young adults. Esther Dyer viewed the cooperative process as a scale with professional courtesy at one end and coordination at the other. She cautioned, however, that professional courtesy is based on interpersonal relationships and "if the individuals change,

the cooperative structure may . . . collapse" (Dyer 1978, 7).

The concept of different levels of cooperation has been discussed in other studies as well. Not surprisingly, these studies deal with higher levels requiring analysis of the participating libraries' roles, policies, and objectives. Billman and Owens determined that the quality and frequency of communication should be relatively high to establish a cooperative collection development program (1985). In this type of collaboration, the pre-planning, planning, implementing, and evaluating should be viewed as an ongoing process (Kachel 1995).

If most librarians were asked at what level their cooperative activities occurred, their answers might vary considerably. Donna Shannon found this to be true in her study of public librarians in one county in North Carolina. She suggested the reason for this was the lack of an evaluative model for determining levels of cooperation, leaving the librarians to base their responses on their own perceptions. Her creation of a four-level model helped her to determine that much of the library cooperation occurred at level two, and, more importantly, her study indicated that libraries were not progressing to any higher levels (1991).

The literature relating to school and public library cooperation still appears to be more descriptive in nature in spite of the recommendations for more analytical and quantitative data. If levels of cooperation were defined in such a way so that libraries could rely on a standardized model for evaluating their programs, then perhaps we would see more formal cooperative efforts.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study used a survey methodology to assess the types of cooperative activities occurring between schools and public libraries in Ohio through the use of a mail questionnaire composed of closed-ended and open-ended items (Appendix A). A cover letter explaining the nature of the study accompanied the questionnaire (Appendix B). This study was limited to a sample size of eighty-eight public libraries selected from a population of all public libraries listed in the Directory of Ohio Libraries. One sample was randomly selected from each of the eighty-eight counties in Ohio.

Respondents were classified by type of library, size of collection in volumes, type of community served, and total number of library staff. A list of activities representing different types of cooperative ventures was presented and respondents were asked to indicate the ones in which they participated and whether contact was initiated by a school or public library. Finally, respondents were asked to rank their three most utilized activities to determine which ones were considered the most important. Because data was gathered from a sample of the population, there may be differences between the sample responses and those that would be collected from the total population.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

From a total of eighty-eight questionnaires that were mailed, fifty-nine (67%) were returned. Responses to those questions which sought to classify the responding libraries are presented in Table 1. The types of libraries responding were divided evenly between main libraries with branches (49%), and main libraries without branches (49%); only one (1.7%) of the questionnaires returned was from a branch library. Over half of the responding libraries (62.7%) served rural (including small town and village) populations, while 22% and 15% of the libraries that responded served urban and suburban communities respectively. Twenty-five (42%) of the responding libraries had a collection size of 50,001 to 100,000 volumes; fifteen (25.4%) had 25,000 to 50,000; fourteen (23.7%) had over 100,000; and only five (8.4%) had under 25,000 volumes in their collections. Thirty-three (55.9%) of the libraries had staffs that numbered 16 and over; thirteen (22%) had 11-15 staff members; ten (16.9%) had 6-10; and three (5%) had 1-5 staff members.

Library personnel responsible for managing cooperative activities are presented in Table 2. More than half (61%) of the respondents had a young adult adult or children's librarian while fifteen (25.4%) indicated that their cooperative activities were managed by a generalist.

Table 1.--Classification of Respondents by Demographic Characteristics

Demographic Characteristic	(N=59)	f	Percent
Type of library			
Main library with branches		29	49.0
Branch library		1	1.7
Main library without branches		29	49.0
Collection size (in volumes)			
under 25,000		5	8.4
25,000-50,000		15	25.4
50,001-100,000		25	42.0
over 100,000		14	23.7
Type of population served			
Urban		13	22.0
Suburban		9	15.0
Rural		37	62.7
Total number of library staff			
1-5		3	5.0
6-10		10	16.9
11-15		13	22.0
over 15		33	55.9

A local/regional consultant was used by five (8.5%) of the respondents and three (5%) of the libraries had a school services coordinator.

Table 2.--Personnel Responsible for Cooperative Activities

Personnel	(N=59)	f	Percent
Young adult/childrens librarian		36	61.0
Generalist		15	25.4
Consultant from local/regional system		5	8.5
School services coordinator		3	5.0

All of the libraries surveyed engaged in some form of cooperative activity with public schools (see Table 3). The five activities most often mentioned were: class visits to the public library (95%); written/oral communication to school personnel promoting library services (88.1%); planning and promotion of summer reading programs (84.7%); assignment alerts (67.8%); and resource sharing (55.9%). Class visits were the activities reported as most frequently engaged in by respondents to both Wolfe's (1990) and Weiser's (1992) surveys of public and school libraries in Ohio. Other activities most often mentioned in this survey, which were reported as occurring most frequently in the previous Ohio studies, include assignment alerts and resource sharing. In addition, twenty-four (40%) of the respondents included the following activities in the "other" category on the questionnaire: sponsorship of writing contests; co-writing Buckeye Book Award grants; special exhibits of students' work; and musical and dramatic performances by students in the public libraries.

Table 3.--Total Number of Respondents Participating in
Individual Cooperative Activities

Cooperative Activity	(N=59)	f	Percent
Class visits to the public library		56	95.0
Written/oral communication to school personnel		52	88.1
Planning and promotion of summer reading programs		50	84.7
Assignment alerts		40	67.8
Resource sharing		33	55.9
Collection development		28	47.5
Booktalks		25	84.7
Other		24	40.6
Exchange of bibliographies		22	37.3
Document delivery		18	31.0
Literacy programs		17	28.8
Joint celebration of library events		15	25.4
Shared online catalogs		11	18.6
Latchkey programs		4	6.8

When asked to indicate whether the initial contact for implementing each of the activities was made by a public library or school, respondents reported that for all but two of the activities (latchkey programs and class visits), the

majority of the contacts were initiated by public libraries (see Table 4).

Table 4.--Initiating Cooperative Activities by Institution

Cooperative Activity	Total		Initiated by public library		Initiated by school	
	F	(%)	F	(%)	F	(%)
Class visits to the public library	56	100.0	22	39.3	34	60.7
Written/oral communication to school personnel	52	100.0	50	96.2	2	3.8
Planning and promotion of summer reading programs	50	100.0	50	100.0	---	---
Assignment alerts	40	100.0	32	80.0	8	20.0
Resource sharing	33	100.0	28	84.8	5	15.2
Collection development	28	100.0	25	89.2	3	10.7
Booktalks	25	100.0	19	76.0	6	25.0
Other	24	100.0	18	75.0	6	25.0
Exchange of bibliographies	22	100.0	14	63.6	8	36.3
Document delivery	18	100.0	16	88.8	2	11.1
Literacy programs	17	100.0	11	64.7	6	35.2
Joint celebration of library events	15	100.0	10	66.6	5	33.3
Shared online catalog	11	100.0	10	90.9	1	9.1
Latchkey programs	4	100.0	2	50.0	2	50.0

A summary of the respondents' rankings of the three most utilized activities in their libraries is presented in Table 5. Class visits was the activity which was rated first by responding libraries the most. Other activities which were rated first by at least five of the libraries include:

planning and promotion of summer reading programs; resource sharing; and assignment alerts.

Table 5.--Top Three Most Utilized Activities

	N	Ranked 1st f	(%)	Ranked 2d f	(%)	Ranked 3d f	(%)
Class visits to the public library	56	22	39.2	16	28.6	7	12.5
Written/oral communication to school personnel	52	3	5.8	3	9.6	11	21.5
Planning and promotion of summer reading programs	50	11	22.0	13	26.0	10	20.0
Assignment alerts	40	5	12.5	3	7.5	4	10.0
Resource sharing	33	7	21.7	5	15.1	5	15.1
Collection development	28	3	10.7	3	10.7	4	14.3
Booktalks	25	1	4.0	3	12.6	6	24.0
Other	24	4	16.7	5	20.8	3	12.5
Exchange of bibliographies	22	1	4.5	---	---	5	22.7
Document delivery	18	4	22.2	1	5.5	---	---
Literacy programs	17	3	17.6	---	---	---	---
Joint celebration of library events	15	2	13.3	1	6.7	1	6.7
Shared online catalogs	11	2	18.2	---	---	3	27.3
Latchkey programs	4	1	25.0	---	---	---	---

Fifty-two (88.1%) of the respondents indicated on their questionnaires what factors they considered most important for ensuring the success of cooperative ventures. Their responses were grouped into seven different categories and

are presented in Table 6. Almost half (46%) of the respondents wrote that communication was the key element for guaranteed success. They also elaborated on their responses by describing communication as "ongoing," "continuous," "personal," or "face to face...with school personnel." Some of the respondents felt, however, that communication was a two-way street and that it was a school's responsibility to contact the public library for assistance. On the other hand, there were seven (15.5%) who felt that initiating and maintaining contact was their duty and a vital one for successful cooperation.

Sharing a common goal of educating/servicing youth was a factor mentioned by five (9.6%) respondents. Although some felt that they were "being taken advantage of" by teachers, one respondent stated that public libraries "are there to provide services and information," especially to children.

Four (7.7%) of the respondents indicated that support from school administrators was an important factor for ensuring success.. They felt that administrators should encourage their teachers to make use of the public library and its services, and one respondent went so far as to suggest that they "require their teachers become informed."

The other four factors which were each mentioned by four (5.8%) of the respondents included: adaptability/flexibility when dealing with schools; maintaining a positive and friendly attitude; keeping in touch with the school librarian; and promoting public library services in the school.

Table 6.--Factors Ensuring Successful Cooperative Activities

Factor	N=52	f	Percent
Communication		24	46.0
Initiating contact		7	15.5
Sharing common goal of educating/serviing youth		5	9.6
Adaptability/flexibility		3	5.8
Support from school administration		4	7.7
Attitude		3	5.8
Keeping in touch with school librarian		3	5.8
Promoting services		3	5.8

Probably the most revealing responses to this survey appeared in answer to question ten, which asked for additional comments regarding school and public library cooperation. Respondents reported frustration in dealing with schools, with most of the frustration directed at schools and teachers who do not take advantage of their services or who do not provide advance warning of upcoming assignments that may place a considerable demand on their staffs and collections. On the other hand, there were those respondents who regard schools as their "best customers" and indicated that cooperation was essential in developing quality schools and libraries.

In order to evaluate the levels of school and public library cooperation, a model was used which was based upon

models proposed by Billman and Owens (1985) and Shannon (1991). This model, presented in Figure 1, includes five levels: level one - no cooperation; level two - informal communication; level three - informal cooperation; level four - formal cooperation; and level five - formal coordination.

At level one, no contact has been made by either a school or public library serving a community. A lack of any communication between the two organizations characterizes this level. This level is not applicable in this survey because all of the respondents indicated that they do communicate with schools and participate in at least one of the activities.

Cooperative activities at level two - informal communication are characterized by irregular communication between schools and public libraries. Contact has been made by either of the two organizations for a specific reason such as an assignment alert. In this survey, 68% of the respondents engaged in some form of assignment alert activity.

Level three - informal cooperation activities often focus on a specific event or issue. Because the nature of these activities requires planning and preparation, communication is more consistent. Activities at this level include: booktalks; class visits; written/oral communication to school personnel regarding library services; and latchkey, literacy, and summer reading programs. Of the five activities most often mentioned by respondents, the top

Level I: No Cooperation

No previous efforts made at cooperation. No communication between schools and public libraries.

Level II: Informal Communication

Schools and public libraries remain separate units. Initial contact has been made by either institution. Communication is irregular, usually occurring for a specific reason.

Examples: Assignment alerts

Level III: Informal Cooperation

Communication occurs more consistently and often focuses on specific events or issues. Examples: Booktalks, Class visits, Written /oral communication to school personnel, Latchkey and Literacy programs, Planning and promotion of summer reading programs.

Level IV. Formal Cooperation

Common goals and objectives direct the implementation of cooperative activities. Examples: Resource Sharing, Document delivery, Exchange of bibliographies, Joint celebrations of library events.

Level V: Formal Coordination

Activities are guided by formal and written policies and procedures reached through collaboration between schools and public libraries. Goals and objectives are approved by administrative boards from both institutions. Examples: Collection development, Shared OPACS

Figure 1.--A Model for Cooperation Between Schools and Public Libraries (Billman and Owens, 1985; Shannon, 1991)

three, class visits, written/oral communication, and summer reading programs, fall within this level.

Formal cooperation occurs at level four, where the activities are characterized by the sharing of common goals and objectives. Billman and Owens also mention the presence of "an increased awareness of the...total information resources" available to the community (1995, 187). This level includes activities such as: resource sharing; document

delivery; bibliography exchanges; and joint celebration of library events. Level four activities were mentioned by a smaller percentage of the total respondents than level three activities, but they still accounted for 25.4 to 55.9 percent of the respondents.

The implementation of activities at level five - formal coordination, is guided by formal and written policies and procedures reached through collaborative efforts between schools and public libraries and requires mutual approval from both institutions. Kachel also regards activities at this level as "a potential means of providing additional resources" for patrons (1995, 109). Both collection development and shared online public access catalogs are included at this level. The smaller percentage of respondents (18.6%) indicating their use of shared online public access catalogs can be attributed to the considerable amount of commitment in the form of time and funding required for such an endeavor. Although nearly half (47.5%) of the respondents indicated that they participated in collection development activities with schools, it is believed that a lesser percentage would have resulted if the term "collection development" had been defined for participants in light of the model.

Based upon the model presented here, a larger majority of participants are engaging in cooperative activities at level three than at any of the other levels. Although communication was often mentioned by respondents as the most important factor for ensuring the success of cooperative efforts, the level of communication and the amount of time

and commitment required for more complex ventures may prohibit their implementation.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The results of this survey indicate that school and public library cooperation continues to be a desirable element of service to youth, but there appears to be little progression in the level of activities engaged in by respondents to this survey, when compared to the responses reported in previous studies. This reiterates Shannon's observation that libraries do not progress to higher levels of cooperation (1991). Lack of time was mentioned frequently in the literature as a barrier to communication, but it also appears to be a contributing factor in the popularity of certain activities. Weiser observed that more than half of the institutions surveyed, classified their communication as "seldom" when engaging in a majority of activities (1992).

Is a lack of time a valid reason for not progressing to more advanced levels of cooperation? It appears that activities which require little communication can be successful, but is the assurance of success a motivating factor in the selection of an activity? If schools and public libraries experience future budget cuts, they may be motivated to engage in more collaborative activities. Future studies could survey attitudes toward giving up some of the autonomy that both institutions enjoy. If both schools and

public libraries adopted an attitude that sharing resources can benefit the entire community, then perhaps we would see more commitment to cooperation.

APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE

SURVEY OF TYPES OF COOPERATION BETWEEN PUBLIC LIBRARIES AND SCHOOLS IN THE STATE OF OHIO

Unless otherwise instructed, please check only one (1) response for each item.

1. Type of library: ☐ Main library with branches
☐ Branch library
☐ Main library without branches
2. Collection size: ☐ under 25,000 ☐ 50,001-100,000
(in volumes) ☐ 25,000-50,000 ☐ over 100,000
3. Type of population served by this library:
☐ Urban ☐ Suburban ☐ Rural
4. Total number of library staff:
☐ 1-5 ☐ 6-10 ☐ 11-15 ☐ over 15
5. This library's cooperative activities are managed by:
☐ Consultant from local/regional system ☐ School services coordinator
☐ Young adult/childrens librarian ☐ Generalist
6. This library participates in the following cooperative activities (check all that apply)

☐ Assignment alerts	☐ Class visits to the public library
☐ Collection development	☐ Written/oral communication to school
☐ Document delivery	☐ personnel promoting library services
☐ Latchkey programs	☐ Joint celebration of library events such
☐ Literacy programs	☐ as National Library Week
☐ Exchange of bibliographies	☐ Planning and promotion of summer reading
☐ Resource sharing	☐ programs
☐ Booktalks	☐ Shared online catalogs
☐ Other (please explain) _____	
7. For each of the activities checked in number 6, please indicate whether the initial contact was made by this library or a school by writing PL (Public Library) or S (School) next to the activities listed below.

☐ Assignment alerts	☐ Class visits to the public library
☐ Collection development	☐ Written/oral communication to school
☐ Document delivery	☐ personnel promoting library services
☐ Latchkey programs	☐ Joint celebration of library events such
☐ Literacy programs	☐ as National Library Week
☐ Exchange of bibliographies	☐ Planning and promotion of summer reading
☐ Resource sharing	☐ programs
☐ Booktalks	☐ Shared online catalogs
☐ Other (please explain) _____	

8. Please rank the top three (3) activities which you feel are utilized the most in this library. Use "1" for the most utilized through "3" for the third most utilized.

☐ Assignment alerts	☐ Class visits to the public library
☐ Collection development	☐ Written/oral communication to school
☐ Document delivery	☐ personnel promoting library services
☐ Latchkey programs	☐ Joint celebration of library events such
☐ Literacy programs	☐ as National Library Week
☐ Exchange of bibliographies	☐ Planning and promotion of summer reading
☐ Resource sharing	☐ programs
☐ Booktalks	☐ Shared online catalogs
☐ Other (please explain) _____	

9. What do you feel are the most important factors for ensuring the success of cooperative activities between schools and public libraries?

10. Please feel free to make any additional comments regarding school and public library cooperation in the space below.

Thank you for your time and cooperation. Please return your completed questionnaire to me by December 20, 1995, in the enclosed, stamped envelope addressed as follows:

Frances Turano
 120½ S. Union St.
 Galion, Ohio 44833

APPENDIX B: COVER LETTER

School of Library and Information Science
(216) 672-2782
Fax 216-672-7965



P. O. Box 5190, Kent, Ohio 44242-0001

RE: Survey of Types of Cooperation Between
Schools and Public Libraries in Ohio

November 1, 1995

Dear Library Professional:

I am a graduate student in the School of Library and Information Science at Kent State University. As part of the requirements for my master's degree, I am conducting a survey about cooperation between schools and public libraries in Ohio. The enclosed questionnaire elicits information that will help me to determine what types of cooperative activities occur most frequently. I am hoping to use this information to develop a model which will help libraries evaluate their progress in the cooperation process.

Confidentiality and anonymity are guaranteed as you do not need to sign your name to this questionnaire; only the investigator has access to the survey data. There is no penalty of any kind if you should choose to not participate in this study or if you would withdraw from participation at any time. While your cooperation is essential to the success of this study, it is, of course, voluntary. A copy of the results of this study will be available upon request.

If you have any further questions, please contact me at (419) 468-6607 or Dr. Lois Buttlar, my research advisor, at (216) 672-2782. If you have any further questions regarding research at Kent State University, you may contact Dr. Richard Rubin, Departmental Research Reviewer, at (216) 672-2782.

Thank you for your cooperation; it is greatly appreciated. Please return the questionnaire to me by December 20, 1995, in the enclosed, stamped envelope addressed as follows:

Frances Turano
120 1/2 S. Union Street
Galion, Ohio 44833

Sincerely,

Frances Turano
Graduate Student
School of Library and Information Science

REFERENCE LIST

- Aaron, Shirley L. 1981. School/public library cooperation-the way it is. Catholic Library World 52 (February): 280-285.
- Billman, Betty V. and Patricia Owens. 1985-1986. School and public library cooperation: A prerequisite for cooperative collection development. Collection Management 7 (Fall/Winter): 183-195.
- Bloom, Linda. 1992. The math and science enrichment center at East Cleveland Public Library: Public school-public library cooperation. Ohio Libraries 5 (March/April): 16.
- Callison, Daniel, Judy Fink, and Greg Hager. 1989. A survey of cooperation and communication between public and school libraries in Indiana and beyond. Indiana Libraries 8: 78-86.
- Callison, Daniel. 1991. A national survey on public library and secondary library cooperation: Do they know each other? Indiana Media Journal 13 (Summer): 17-21.
- Chelton, Mary K. 1989. The first national survey of services and resources for young adults in public libraries. Journal of Youth Services in Libraries 2 (Spring): 224-231.
- Del Vecchio, Stephen. 1993. Connecting libraries and schools with CLASP. Wilson Library Bulletin 68 (September): 38-40.
- Dyer, Esther R. 1978. Cooperation in library service to children. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.
- Fasick, Adele M. 1991. Managing children's services in the public library. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- Fitzgibbons, Shirley. 1989. Cooperation between teachers, school librarians, and public librarians: Improving library services for children and young adults. Indiana Libraries. 8: 57-69.

- Kachel, Debra E. 1995. Look inward before looking outward: Preparing the school library media center for cooperative collection development. School Library Media Quarterly 25 (Winter): 101-113.
- National Education Association. 1899. Report of the Committee on the Relations of Public Libraries to Public Schools. In Dorothy M. Broderick. 1967. Plus ca change: Classic patterns in public/school library relations. Library Journal 92 (15 May): 1995-97.
- Reading, Barbara. 1992. School/public library cooperation. Show-Me Libraries 44 (Fall): 45-47.
- Roy, Lorene. 1993. National findings, national measures: The NCES survey on children's services in public libraries and Output measures for public library service to children. Journal of Youth Services in Libraries 4 (Winter): 181-184.
- Shannon, Donna. 1991. Cooperation between school and public libraries: A study of one North Carolina county. North Carolina Libraries 49 (Summer): 67-70.
- Stenstrom, Ralph H. 1970. Cooperation between types of libraries 1940-1968: An annotated bibliography. Chicago: American Library Association.
- Vandergrift, Kay E. 1994. Cooperative dialogue: Using an instrument to empower. Voice of Youth Advocate 17 (June): 73-77.
- Weiser, Lisa Antognoli. 1992. Survey of school library media specialists on cooperative programs between schools and public libraries. Masters Research Paper, Kent State University.
- Wolfe, Lynn. 1990. Cooperative programs between schools and public libraries in Ohio. Masters Research Paper, Kent State University.
- Wools, Blanche E. 1973. Cooperative library services to children in public libraries and public school systems in selected communities in Indiana. Ph.D. diss., Indiana University. In Daniel Callison, Judy Fink, and Greg Hager. 1989. A survey of cooperation and communication between public and school libraries in Indiana and beyond. Indiana Libraries: 78-86.